UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/505,949	02/15/2000	Michael Chow	042390.P6447	5605

7590 01/30/2004

Thomas M Coester
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor and Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER	
LI, AIMEE J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2183	16

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/505,949	CHOW ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aimee J Li	2183	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: *See Continuation Sheet*.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☒ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: *1-19*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☒ Other: *See Continuation Sheet*

Continuation of 2. NOTE:
Claims 10 and 19 have been amended from "detecting whether the input includes a token" to "detecting whether the input contains a token". This amendment narrows the scope of the claim and requires further search and consideration.

Continuation of 10. Other:
Applicant states on page 5 of the Remarks in essence "...final rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-16, and 19 is premature since Hennessy is newly cited art". Examiner notes that this was a typographical error on the behalf of the examiner. The examiner originally wrote in the Office Action mailed 04 November 2003 in paragraphs 28-30

Applicants argue on pages 5-6 and 10-11 essentially

> "Applicants submit that the teachings of Blomgren are limited to processing opcodes of different lengths. Applicants submit that there is no suggestion as to any variation in the word sizes between the RISC and CISC instruction sets within Blomgren."

This has not been found persuasive. The RISC and CISC instruction sets are inherently different sizes, as asserted in prior office actions. Extrinsic evidence from **Hennessy and Patterson's Computer Architecture: A Qualitative Approach** ©1997 was provided with the last office action towards this effect. **Hennessy** states on page 91, section 3.2.1, paragraph 2 "General Characteristics of CISC machines...The result is instructions that are of widely varying lengths and execution times." He also states on page 93, section 3.2.3, paragraph 3 "Fixed Instruction Length If one instruction is to issue per clock cycle, it is natural that RISC designers would limit all instructions to a fixed length, usually 1 word." Relevant portions of are cited and specific characteristics are highlighted. As can be seen by the quotes from **Hennessy and Patterson**, CISC and RISC instructions sets are different sizes, since CISC has instructions of varying lengths and RISC has fixed length instructions.

Applicants argue on page 6 essentially "Applicants submit that the cited passages implies that the instruction word size is the same for both the CISC and RISC instruction sets." This has not been found persuasive. The passage cited by the Applicants can, at most, not relate to instruction word size. The interpretation submitted above ignores the inherent principles and facts about RISC and CISC instruction sets, as set forth above and in **Hennessy and Patterson**. The passage taken in light of the inherent attributes, as stated in **Hennessy and Patterson**, of RISC and CISC instruction sets is an example of why the RISC and CISC instruction sets are different sizes.

However, the Examiner was not referring to information found in Hennessy and Patterson, but to information found in Heuring and Jordan, which was provided with a prior office action. The typographical errors are bolded above. Should the Applicant reference the sections referred to, the quoted material would found in those areas. The corrected paragraphs follow and corrected typographical errors are bolded

Applicants argue on pages 5-6 and 10-11 essentially

> "Applicants submit that the teachings of Blomgren are limited to processing opcodes of different lengths. Applicants submit that there is no

suggestion as to any variation in the word sizes between the RISC and CISC instruction sets within Blomgren."

This has not been found persuasive. The RISC and CISC instruction sets are inherently different sizes, as asserted in prior office actions. Extrinsic evidence from **Heuring and Jordan Computer Systems Design and Architecture** ©1997 provided with the last office action towards this effect. **Heuring** states on page 91, section 3.2.1, paragraph 2 "General Characteristics of CISC machines...The result is instructions that are of widely varying lengths and execution times." He also states on page 93, section 3.2.3, paragraph 3 "Fixed Instruction Length If one instruction is to issue per clock cycle, it is natural that RISC designers would limit all instructions to a fixed length, usually 1 word." Relevant portions of are cited and specific characteristics are highlighted. As can be seen by the quotes from **Heuring and Jordan**, CISC and RISC instructions sets are different sizes, since CISC has instructions of varying lengths and RISC has fixed length instructions.

Applicants argue on page 6 essentially "Applicants submit that the cited passages implies that the instruction word size is the same for both the CISC and RISC instruction sets." This has not been found persuasive. The passage cited by the Applicants can, at most, not relate to instruction word size. The interpretation submitted above ignores the inherent principles and facts about RISC and CISC instruction sets, as set forth above and in **Heuring and Jordan**. The passage taken in light of the inherent attributes, as stated in **Heuring and Jordan**, of RISC and CISC instruction sets is an example of why the RISC and CISC instruction sets are different sizes.

Applicant argues in essence on page 6, "Applicants submit that there is no suggestion as to any variation in the word sizes between the RISC and CISC instruction sets...". This has not been found persuasive. Blomgren describes a system where RISC and CISC instruction **words** are processed. RISC and CISC instruction **words** are of **different sizes**, as stated in the above response to Amendment D. As for whether Blomgren's column 6, lines 37-44 indicates a single instruction word size, the passage cited by the Applicants can, at most, not relate to instruction word size. The interpretation submitted above ignores the inherent principles and facts about RISC and CISC instruction words, as stated in the original response.

EDDIE CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100